



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Commissioner of Education
President of the University of the State of New York
89 Washington Ave., Room 111
Albany, New York 12234

E-mail: commissioner@mail.nysed.gov
Twitter: @JohnKingNYSED
Tel: (518) 474-5844
Fax: (518) 473-4909

May 6, 2013

Revised

Dr. Corliss Kaiser, Superintendent
Fayetteville-Manlius School
8199 East Seneca Turnpike
Manlius, New York 13104

Dear Superintendent Kaiser:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your Annual Professional Performance Review Plan (APPR) meets the criteria outlined in Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Commissioner's Regulations and has been approved for the 2012-2013 school year. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided on your APPR form, including the certifications and assurances that are part of your approved APPR. If any material changes are made to your approved APPR plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

Please be advised that, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c, the Department will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may order a corrective action plan if there are unacceptably low correlation results between the student growth subcomponent and any other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness and/or if the teacher or principal scores or ratings show little differentiation across educators and/or the lack of differentiation is not justified by equivalently consistent student achievement results.

The New York State Education Department and I look forward to continuing our work together, with the goal of ensuring that every school has world-class educators in the classroom, every teacher has a world-class principal to support his or her professional growth, and every student achieves college and career readiness.

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John B. King, Jr." in a cursive style.

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: J. Francis Manning

NOTES: If your district/BOCES has provided for value-added measures (15 points vs. 20 points scale and categorization of your district/BOCES's grade configurations) in your APPR and no value-added measures are approved by the Board of Regents for a grade/subject and/or grade configuration for the 2012-13 school year, your district/BOCES will be required to revise and resubmit its APPR accordingly. Conversely, if your district/BOCES has not provided for value-added measures in your district/BOCES's APPR submission and value-added measures are approved for the 2012-13 school year, your district/BOCES will be required to revise and resubmit its APPR accordingly.

Only documents that are incorporated by reference in your APPR have been reviewed and are considered as part of your APPR; therefore, any supplemental documents such as memorandums of agreement or understanding that were uploaded with your APPR but are not incorporated by reference in your APPR have not been reviewed. However, the Department reserves the right to review the uploaded attachments at any time for consistency with your APPR form and/or to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations; and as a result of such review, the Department may reject your APPR plan and/or require corrective action.

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Friday, April 26, 2013

1

Disclaimers

The Department will review the contents of each school district's or BOCES' APPR plan as submitted using this online form, including required attachments, to determine if the plan rigorously complies with Education Law section 3012-c and subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents. Department approval does not imply endorsement of specific educational approaches in a district's or BOCES' plan.

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department reserves the right to request further information from the school district or BOCES, as necessary, as part of its review.

If the Department reasonably believes through investigation or otherwise that statements made in this APPR plan are not true or accurate, it reserves the right to reject this plan at any time and/or to request additional information to determine the truth and/or accuracy of such statements.

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 421001060000

If this is not your BEDS Number, please enter the correct one below

421001060000

1.2) School District Name: FAYETTEVILLE-MANLIUS CSD

If this is not your school district, please enter the correct one below

FAYETTEVILLE-MANLIUS CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

SIG districts only: Indicate whether this APPR plan is for SIG schools only or for the entire district. Other districts and BOCES, please skip this question.

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

Please check if the district has applied for and/or has been awarded any of the following (if applicable):

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

1.5) Assurances Assure that the content of this form represents the district/BOCES' entire APPR plan and that the APPR plan is in compliance with Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents	Checked
1.5) Assurances Assure that this APPR plan will be posted on the district or BOCES website by September 10, or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later	Checked
1.5) Assurances Assure that it is understood that this district/BOCES' APPR plan will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website following approval	Checked

1.6) Is this a first-time submission, a re-submission, or a submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan?

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

1.7) Is this submission for an annual or multi-year plan?

If the plan is multi-year, please write the years that are included.

Annual (2012-13)

2. Growth on State Assessments or Comparable Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Friday, April 26, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

For teachers in grades 4 - 8 Common Branch, ELA, and Math, NYSED will provide a value-added growth score. That score will incorporate students' academic history compared to similarly academically achieving students and will use special considerations for students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents. NYSED will also provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 25 points.

While most teachers of 4-8 Common Branch, ELA and Math will have state-provided measures, some may teach other courses in addition where there is no state-provided measure. Teachers with 50 – 100% of students covered by State-provided growth measures will receive a growth score from the State for the full Growth subcomponent score of their evaluation. Teachers with 0 – 49% of students covered by State-provided growth measures must have SLOs for the Growth subcomponent of their evaluation and one SLO must use the State-provided measure if applicable for any courses. (See guidance for more detail on teachers with State-provided measures AND SLOs.)

Please note that if the Board of Regents does not approve a value-added measure for these grades/subjects for 2012-13, the State-provided growth measure will be used for 20 points in this subcomponent. NYSED will provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 20 points.

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

2.1) Assurances Assure that the value-added growth score provided by NYSED will be used, where applicable.	Checked
2.1) Assurances Assure that the State-provided growth measure will be used if a value-added measure has not been approved for 2012-13.	Checked

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

Student Learning Objectives will be the other comparable growth measures for teachers in the following grades and subjects. (Please note that for teachers with more than one grade and subject, SLOs must cover the courses taught with the largest number of students, combining sections with common assessments, until a majority of students are covered.)

For core subjects: grades 6-8 Science and Social Studies, high school English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies courses associated in 2010-11 with Regents exams or, in the future, with other State assessments, the following must be used as the evidence of student learning within the SLO:

State assessments (or Regents or Regent equivalents), *required if one exists*

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

District-determined assessments from list of State-approved 3rd party assessments; or

District, regional or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

For other grades/subjects: district-determined assessments from options below may be used as evidence of student learning within the SLO:

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments

Please note: If your district or BOCES does not have grade/subject-specific teachers for one or more of the rows in questions 2.2 through 2.9, choose "Not applicable" from the drop-down box and type N/A in the assessment box. This would be appropriate if, for example, common branch teachers also teach 6th grade science and/or social studies and therefore would have State-provided growth measures, not SLOs; the district or BOCES does not have certain grades; the district does not offer a specific subject; etc.

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where applicable.

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fayetteville-Manlius District-wide Assessment-Kindergarten Language Arts
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMS WEB
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMS WEB

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

For K-3 ELA: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The attached information below is from our APPR plan that was mutually developed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association. The information shows the specific formulas used to determine point allocations for teachers utilizing an SLO. These formulas demonstrate that each teacher will have the ability to receive every rating from 0-20 points (or 0-25 for teachers with value-added scores). This information from the district APPR plan applies to all teachers in the district.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where applicable.

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fayetteville-Manlius District-wide Math Assessment-K
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide Math Assessment-1st Grade
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide Math Assessment- 2nd Grade

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

For Grades K-3 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The attached information below is from our APPR plan that was mutually developed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association. The information shows the specific formulas used to determine point allocations for teachers utilizing an SLO. These formulas demonstrate that each teacher will have the ability to receive every rating from 0-20 points. When New York State implements the value added model, this information will be updated to reflect a scoring range from
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	0-25. This information from the district APPR plan applies to all teachers in the district.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where available.

	Science	Assessment
6	Not applicable	N/A
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fayetteville-Manlius District-wide Science Final Assessment-7th Grade

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

For Grades 6-8 Science: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The attached information below is from our APPR plan that was mutually developed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association. The information shows the specific formulas used to determine point allocations for teachers utilizing an SLO. These formulas demonstrate that each teacher will have the ability to receive every rating from 0-20 points. When New York State implements the value added model, this information will be updated to reflect a scoring range from 0-25. This information from the district APPR plan applies to all teachers in the district.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where available.

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	Not applicable	N/A
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fayetteville-Manlius District-wide Social Studies assessment-7th grade
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fayetteville-Manlius District-wide Social Studies assessment-8th grade

For Grades 6-8 Social Studies: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The attached information below is from our APPR plan that was mutually developed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association. The information shows the specific formulas used to determine point allocations for teachers utilizing an SLO. These formulas demonstrate that each teacher will have the ability to receive every rating from 0-20 points. When New York State implements the value added model, this information will be updated to reflect a scoring range from 0-25. This information from the district APPR plan applies to all teachers in the district.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessments must be used where available.

Note: Additional high school social studies courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

		Assessment
Global 1	Regents Assessment	NYS Global 2 Regents Exam

	Social Studies Regents Courses	Assessment
Global 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
American History	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

For High School Social Studies Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The attached information below is from our APPR plan that was mutually developed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association. The information shows the specific formulas used to determine point allocations for teachers utilizing an SLO. These formulas demonstrate that each teacher will have the ability to receive every rating from 0-20 points. When New York State implements the value added model, this information will be updated to reflect a scoring range from 0-25. This information from the district APPR plan applies to all teachers in the district.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessments must be used where available.

Note: Additional high school science courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Science Regents Courses	Assessment
Living Environment	Regents Assessment	Regents assessment
Earth Science	Regents Assessment	Regents assessment
Chemistry	Regents Assessment	Regents assessment
Physics	Regents Assessment	Regents assessment

For High School Science Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The attached information below is from our APPR plan that was mutually developed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association. The information shows the specific formulas used to determine point allocations for teachers utilizing an SLO. These formulas demonstrate that each teacher will have the ability to receive every rating from 0-20 points. When New York State implements the value added model, this information will be updated to reflect a scoring range from 0-25. This information from the district APPR plan applies to all teachers in the district.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessment must be used where available.

Note: Additional high school math courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Math Regents Courses	Assessment
Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Geometry	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Algebra 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

For High School Math Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>The attached information below is from our APPR plan that was mutually developed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association. The information shows the specific formulas used to determine point allocations for teachers utilizing an SLO. These formulas demonstrate that each teacher will have the ability to receive every rating from 0-20 points. When New York State implements the value added model, this information will be updated to reflect a scoring range from 0-25. This information from the district APPR plan applies to all teachers in the district.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.</p>

2.9) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessment must be used where available. Be sure to select the English Regents assessment in at least one grade in Task 2.9 (9, 10, and/or 11).

Note: Additional high school English courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents Assessment (English)
Grade 10 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents Assessment (English)
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents Assessment (English)

For High School English Language Arts: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>The attached information below is from our APPR plan that was mutually developed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association. The information shows the specific formulas used to determine point allocations for teachers utilizing an SLO. These formulas demonstrate that each teacher</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

will have the ability to receive every rating from 0-20 points. When New York State implements the value added model, this information will be updated to reflect a scoring range from 0-25. This information from the district APPR plan applies to all teachers in the district.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.

Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.

Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.

Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.

Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

2.10) All Other Courses

Fill in, as applicable, for all other teachers in additional grades/subjects that have Student Learning Objectives. If you need additional space, duplicate this form and upload (below) as an attachment to your APPR plan. You may combine into one line any groups of teachers for whom the answers in the boxes are the same including, for example, "all other teachers not named above" .

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
K-12 Special Education, Curriculum Resource, Reading, Library Media	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Fayetteville-Manlius English Language Arts Building State Results
AIS Math (K-6)	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Fayetteville-Manlius Math Building State Assessment
K-12 Music and Art	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA Building NYS State Assessment
PE	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA Building NYS State Assessment
K-12 Health	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA Building NYS State Assessment
K-12 ESL	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA Building NYS State Assessment
6-8 Family and Consumer Science	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA Building NYS State Assessment
5 -12 Technology	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Math Building NYS State Assessment
8-12 LOTE	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fayetteville-Manlius District-wide Grade and Subject Specific Common Assessment
Business	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA NYS State Assessment (Regents)

For all other courses, as applicable: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>The attached information below is from our APPR plan that was mutually developed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association. The information shows the specific formulas used to determine point allocations for teachers utilizing an SLO. These formulas demonstrate that each teacher will have the ability to receive every rating from 0-20 points. When New York State implements the value added model, this information will be updated to reflect a scoring range from 0-25. This information from the district APPR plan applies to all teachers in the district.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.</p>

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 2.10: All Other Courses" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 2.10. (MS Word)

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 2.2 through 2.10 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5364/125875-TXEttx9bQW/Growth-Comparable Measure.pdf

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in setting targets for Comparable Growth Measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which include: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

If educators have more than one state-provided growth or value-added measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI rating and score for the growth subcomponent according to a formula determined by the Commissioner. (Examples: Common branch teacher with state-provided value-added measures for both ELA and Math in 4th grades; Middle school math teacher with both 7th and 8th grade math courses.)

If educators have more than one SLO for comparable growth (or a State-provided growth measure and an SLO for comparable growth), the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points which Districts must weight proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html).	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Friday, April 26, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

"Comparable across classrooms" means that the same locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth must be used across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district or BOCES.

Please note: If your district or BOCES does not have grade/subject-specific teachers for one or more of the rows in questions 3.1 through 3.11, choose "Not applicable" from the drop-down box and type N/A in the assessment box. This would be appropriate if, for example, the district does not have certain grades, the district does not offer a specific subject, etc.

Locally selected measures for common branch teachers: This form calls for locally selected measures in both ELA and math in grades typically served by common branch teachers. Districts may select local measures for common branch teachers that involve subjects other than ELA and math. Whatever local measure is selected for common branch teachers, please enter it under ELA and/or math and describe the assessment used, including the subject. Use N/A for other lines in that grade level that are served by common branch teachers. Describe the HEDI criteria for the measure in the same section where you identified the locally selected measure and assessment.

.Please note: Only one locally-selected measure is required for teachers in the same grade/subject across the district, but some districts may prefer to have more than one measure for all teachers within a grade/subject. Also note: Districts may use more than one locally-selected measure for **different** groups of teachers **within a grade/subject** if the district/BOCES verifies comparability based on Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. This APPR form only provides space for one measure for teachers in the same grade/subject across the district. Therefore, if more than one locally-selected measure is used for all teachers in any grades or subject, districts must complete additional copies of this form and upload as attachments for review.

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT FOR TEACHERS IN GRADES FOR WHICH THERE IS AN APPROVED VALUE-ADDED MEASURE (15 points)

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers.

The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher’s students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students’ level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students’ performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher’s students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students’ performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher’s students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally

- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in subclause 1) or 2) of this clause

- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment

- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
 - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
 - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District- Wide 4th Grade ELA Benchmark Assessment-4th grade
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide 5th Grade ELA Benchmark Assessment-5th grade

6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide 6th Grade ELA Benchmark Assessment-6th grade
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide 7th Grade ELA Benchmark Assessment-7th grade
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide 8th Grade ELA Benchmark Assessment-8th grade

For Grades 4-8 ELA: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in the locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide 4th Grade Math Benchmark Assessment-4th grade
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide 5th Grade Math Benchmark Assessment-5th grade
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide 6th Grade Math Benchmark Assessment-6th grade

7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide 7th Grade Math Benchmark Assessment-7th grade
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide 8th Grade Math Benchmark Assessment-8th grade

For Grades 4-8 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in the locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.1 and 3.2 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

[assets/survey-uploads/5139/125880-rhJdBgDruP/Locally Selected Measure Final Point Allocation_1.pdf](#)

LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT FOR ALL OTHER TEACHERS (20 points)

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers.

The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher's students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally

- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in 1) or 2), above

- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment

- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
 - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
 - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

- 7) Student Learning Objectives (only allowable for teachers in grades/subjects without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
---------------------------------------------------------	------------

K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide ELA Assessment-K
1	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide ELA Assessment-1st grade
2	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide ELA Assessment-2nd grade
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide Benchmark Assessment- 3rd grade

For Grades K-3 ELA: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in the locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide Math Assessment-K
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide Math Assessment-1st grade

2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide Math Assessment-2nd grade
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius District-Wide Math Benchmark Assessment-3rd grade

For Grades K-3 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in the locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Not Applicable
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	8th Grade NYS Science Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	8th Grade NYS Science Assessment

For Grades 6-8 Science: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in teh locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Not Applicable
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius Social Studies Benchmark Assessment-7th grade
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Fayetteville-Manlius Social Studies Benchmark Assessment-8th grade

For Grades 6-8 Social Studies: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in teh locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far

achievement for grade/subject.	exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.8) High School Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

Note: Additional high school social studies courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fayetteville-Manlius District Developed Common Final-SS Global 1
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Global 10 Regents Exam
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	US History Regents Exam

For High School Social Studies: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in the locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.9) High School Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

Note: Additional high school science courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Regents Living Environment
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Regents Earth Science
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Regents Chemistry
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Regents Physics

For High School Science: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in the locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are

within one standard deviation.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.10) High School Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

Note: Additional high school math courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algera 1 Regents
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Geometry Regents
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra 2 Regents

For High School Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in the locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

Note: Additional high school English courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	English Regents
Grade 10 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	English Regents
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	English Regents

For High School English Language Arts: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in the locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

3.12) All Other Courses

Fill in for additional grades/subjects, as applicable. If you need additional space, complete additional copies of this form and upload (below) as attachments.

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-12 Special Education, Curriculum Resource, Reading, Library Media	3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	ELA NYS Assessment

K-6 AIS Math	3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	Math NYS Assessment
K-12 Music and Art, PE	3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	ELA NYS Assessment
LOTE	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Grade and Subject specific regionally developed common assessments
K-12 Health, ESL, FACS	3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	ELA NYS Assessment
Technology	3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	Math NYS Assessment
9-12 all other courses	3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	ELA NYS REGENTS EXAM

For all additional courses, as applicable: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The document attached below is an excerpt from the mutually developed and Board of Education approved APPR plan. This provides formulas and scales for the various measurement options of teachers in the locally-selected measures section of APPR. This excerpt was developed to provide clear information to building principals and teachers regardless of the options chosen (SLO, Local benchmark assessments, etc.)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have far exceeded the District's expectation for this group of students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have met the District expectation for this group of students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have not met the expected growth for this group of students but are within one standard deviation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Details of the process for assigning points can be found in the attachment. Teachers receiving a score in this range have fallen

grade/subject.

far below (> than 1 S.D.) below expectations for this group of students.

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 3.12: All Other Courses" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 3.12. (MS Word)

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.4 through 3.12 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5139/125880-y92vNseFa4/Locally Selected Measure Final Point Allocation_1.pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in setting targets for local measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

No locally developed controls or adjustments will be made. All cut off scores will be determined by the district's office of curriculum and instruction and based on previous student performance. All SLO goals will be vetted by the building principal and will be reviewed based on baseline data collected by the staff writing the SLO.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score. Examples may include: 4th grade teacher with locally-selected measures for both ELA and Math; High School teacher with more than 1 SLO.

Any teacher who has more than one locally selected measure will have their scores combined. Scores will be weighted by the number of students in each subject or class they teach so that the final score accurately reflects the total number of students taught who took those assessments and were measured. For example, if a 4th grade teacher teaches 25 students for math and 21 for language arts, the scores for math will be weighted slightly more because there is a higher "n" in math than in ELA.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

3.16) Assurances Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that use of locally-developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators'	Checked

performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	
3.16) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the locally-selected measures subcomponent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district.	Checked
3.16) Assurances If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that all locally-selected measures for a teacher are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Thursday, April 25, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

Select a teacher practice rubric from the menu of State-approved rubrics to assess performance based on NYS Teaching Standards. If your district has been granted a variance by NYSED through the variance process, select "district variance" from the menu.

The "Second Rubric" space is required for districts that have chosen an observation-only rubric (CLASS or NYSTCE) from the State-approved list.

(Note: Any district may use multiple rubrics, as long as the same rubric(s) is used for all classroom teachers in a grade/subject across the district.)

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

State the number of points (if any) that will be assigned to each of the following measures, making sure that the points total 60. If you are not using a particular measure, enter 0.

This APPR form only provides one space for assigning points within other measures for teachers. If your district/BOCES prefers to assign points differently for different groups of teachers, enter the points assignment for one group of teachers below. For the other group(s) of teachers, fill out copies of this form and upload as an attachment for review.

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of teachers covered (e.g., "probationary teachers"):

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	0

If the above points assignment is not for "all teachers," fill out an additional copy of "Form 4.2: Points Within Other Measures" for each group of teachers, combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 4.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

If you indicated above that 1 or more points will be assigned to feedback using a State-approved survey tool, please check the box below:

(No response)

If the district plans to use one or more of the following surveys of P-12 students from the menu of State-approved surveys, please check all that apply. If your district has been granted a variance by NYSED through the variance process, select "district variance" from the menu. Note: As the State-approved survey lists are updated, this form will be updated with additional approved survey tools.

[SurveyTools.0] Tripod Early Elementary Student Perception Survey K-2	(No response)
[SurveyTools.1] Tripod Elementary Student Perception Survey 3-5	(No response)
[SurveyTools.2] Tripod Secondary Student Perception Survey	(No response)
[SurveyTools.3] District Variance	(No response)

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

4.4) Assurances Assure that all NYS Teaching Standards not addressed in classroom observations are assessed at least once a year.	Checked
4.4) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for the "other measures" subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
4.4) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the "other measures" subcomponent.	Checked
4.4) Assurances Assure that the same rubric(s) is used for all classroom teachers in a grade/subject across the district.	Checked

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

Describe the process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings using the teacher practice rubric and/or any additional instruments used in the district. Include, if applicable, the process for combining results of multiple "other measures" into a single result for this subcomponent.

The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score is based on other measures of teacher effectiveness consistent with standards prescribed by the Commissioner in regulation. The District and the Association have agreed that the New York State United Teachers' Practice Rubric will be utilized by the district to score this section of the evaluation. In order to support continuous professional growth, classroom observations, which consist of a combination of longer (period-length) and shorter (classroom visits and walk-throughs) observations, will be conducted for all teachers. The standards of Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration (Standard 6) and Professional Growth (Standard 7) will also be evaluated by the administrator as part of the summary evaluation at the end of the school year. The following seven standards will each be worth the following points toward the total possible score of 60 points:

- Standard 1: Knowledge of Students and Student Learning (8 points)
- Standard 2: Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning (10 points)
- Standard 3: Instructional Practice (10 points)
- Standard 4: Learning Environment (6 points)
- Standard 5: Assessment for Student Learning (8 points)
- Standard 6: Professional Responsibilities (10 points)
- Standard 7: Professional Growth (8 points)

For the evidence gathered through the observations and the review of Standard 6 and 7, the teacher will receive points for each key element as follows:

- Highly effective – 2.0
- Effective – 1.8
- Developing – 1.0
- Ineffective - 0

All teachers will have multiple observations throughout the school year where evidence will be collected. Each time, the evidence will be aligned to the appropriate standard and element from the rubric and coded to show whether that evidence demonstrated an ineffective, developing, effective, or highly effective example of that element. The information from each observation will be shared and discussed with the teacher. At the end of the year, the evaluator will review all of the evidence collected for each standard and element and assign an overall rating (using a holistic approach) for each element. Then, the points assigned for each element will be totaled to give the teacher a score out of 60 possible points for this section. If the total results in a number with a decimal, the total for this section will be rounded accordingly to the closest whole number.

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

(No response)

Describe the level of performance required for each of the HEDI rating categories, consistent with the narrative descriptions in the regulations for the "other measures" subcomponent. Also describe how the points available within each HEDI category will be assigned.

<p>Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.</p>	<p>In order for a teacher to receive a highly effective rating in this section, the evidence collected during observations and post conferences must clearly demonstrate that the teacher exceeds classroom expectations in the vast majority of indicators on the NYSUT rubric. In order to get a score of 56 or higher in this section, the teacher must exceed classroom effectiveness in most, but not all, categories on the rubric.</p>
<p>Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.</p>	<p>In order for a teacher to receive an effective rating, the teacher must score between 32-55 once all of the points are totaled. This would require that teachers, through evidence collection during observations, to have demonstrated effective teaching in most, but not all of the key elements. A teacher in this category may have some areas that are in the highly effective range but not enough to cause their rating (and point total) to place them at or above 54 points.</p>
<p>Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.</p>	<p>Evidence collection would point to a teacher who is working towards, but has not accomplished, the expected competence in the key elements on the NYSUT Practice Rubric. A score of 10-26 is considered in the developmental range. A teacher in this range will most</p>

likely have a TIP for the following year (assuming that their composite score was in the developing or ineffective range).

Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

A teacher who is showing great deficiencies in most, if not all, key elements on the NYSUT Practice Rubric will receive a rating of 0-9. Through the agreed observation process, a teacher receiving an ineffective score on this section would have little or no evidence that could be collected to show competence in most key elements and teaching standards. Additionally, very little professional growth activities would be evidenced during the school year. Again, teachers in this category will almost certainly have a TIP for the following school year (assuming a composite score in the developing or ineffective range).

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	56-60
Effective	32-55
Developing	10-26
Ineffective	0-9

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

Enter the minimum number of observations of each type, making sure that the number of observations "by building principal or other trained administrators" totals at least 2. If your APPR plan does not include a particular type of observation, enter 0 in that box.

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Will formal/long observations of probationary teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

-
- In Person
-

Will informal/short observations of probationary teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

Enter the minimum number of observations of each type, making sure that the number of observations "by building principal or other trained administrators" totals at least 2. If your APPR plan does not include a particular type of observation, enter 0 in that box.

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Will formal/long observations of tenured teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

-
- In Person
-

Will informal/short observations of tenured teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for student growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for student growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for student growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Ineffective

Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for student growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

For the 2013-2014 school year and beyond, the Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

5.1) The 2012-13 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

Insert district's or BOCES' negotiated HEDI scoring ranges for the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent (same as question 4.5), from 0 to 60 points

Highly Effective	54-60
Effective	27-53
Developing	9-26
Ineffective	0-8

5.2) The 2012-13 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is an approved Value-Added measure for student growth will be:

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

**Locally-selected Measures of
growth or achievement**

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans Assure that teachers who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) within 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year	Checked
6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans Assure that TIP plans shall include: identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas	Checked

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the TIP forms that are used in the school district or BOCES. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips.

<assets/survey-uploads/5265/125889-Df0w3Xx5v6/FM TIP.pdf>

6.3) Appeals Process

Pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c, a teacher may only challenge the following in an appeal:

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

(2) the school district's or BOCES' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c

(3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as well as the school district's or BOCES' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law section 3012-c

Describe the procedure for ensuring that appeals of annual performance evaluations will be handled in a timely and expeditious way:

Appeals

The district and association agree that no decisions with monetary implications will be derived from a teacher's rating of either effective or highly effective. Therefore, teachers will be afforded the opportunity to write a written response to be added to the annual evaluation if their score indicates either of these two scores.

If a tenured teacher receives a rating of developing or ineffective, they will have the right to complete the appeal form if the following

conditions have been met:

1) The teacher has a specific area noted on the evaluation that he/she has documented proof is inaccurate

-and-
2) The maximum number of points that this discrepancy represents has the potential to move the individual's total points to a range of a higher ranking.

-or-

1) If the individual has documentation to show that the procedures required in the APPR were not followed.

In this case, tenured teachers may complete the appeal form within five (5) school days of receiving their composite score. The form will first go to the principal of the building for review. If the principal agrees that an error has been made, the changes can be made immediately. If the building principal disagrees with the documentation provided, he/she will let the individual know of the decision within five (5) school days and the teacher will then have the right to send the same documentation and form to the Superintendent for review within three (3) school days. The Superintendent, or his/her designee, will review the documentation provided and have the right to make the changes to the teacher's score. If he/she disagrees with the documentation, or finds that the documentation does not prove the information inaccurate in the evaluation, he/she may deny the appeal. The final review by the Superintendent should be completed ten (10) school days after receiving the request.

In this case, the teacher will have the right to add a response to his/her file which will be kept with the annual evaluation in the teachers personnel file. The response must be provided to the building principal within five (5) days of receiving the Superintendent's denial of appeal.

In summary, the timeline for tenured teachers who meet the criteria for appeal (listed above) is as follows:

- 1) Teacher submits appeal form to building Principal within 5 days of receipt of score
- 2) Principal has 5 days to approve or deny appeal
- 3) If denied, Teacher may appeal to Superintendent within 3 days of receipt of Principal's decision
- 4) Superintendent has 10 days to approve or deny appeal
- 5) If denied, Teacher has 5 days to write a response to be included in personnel file

Non-tenured teachers will have the right to add a response to the annual evaluation which will be kept in his/her personnel file with the annual evaluation. This response must be written within ten (10) school days of receipt of the composite score.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

Describe the process by which evaluators will be trained and the process for how the district will certify and re-certify lead evaluators. Describe the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability. Describe the duration and nature of such training.

All lead evaluators in the Fayetteville-Manlius have attended ten sessions which covered the following information:

1. New York State Teaching Standards and Leadership Standards
2. Evidence-based observation
3. Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and VA Growth Model data
4. Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics
5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals
6. Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement
7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
8. Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals
9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of ELLs and students with disabilities

All training was under the direction of Jeffrey Gordon, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel with assistance from Jeffrey Craig, Assist Superintendent of OCM BOCES. Each session lasted more than two hours and an emphasis was placed on collecting evidence

and determining appropriate points on the NYSUT rubric. Once these sessions were completed (June 2011) all lead evaluators were certified by the Superintendent of Schools. New administrators to the district who will be utilized as lead evaluators will need to be trained by Jeffrey Gordon on the elements listed above and for the same duration of time before the Superintendent will certify them as lead evaluators.

In order for currently certified lead evaluators to be re-certified, four 1/2 days are scheduled to continue to refine the inter-rater reliability. Re-certification of lead evaluators will be required yearly.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

(1) the New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable

(2) evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research

(3) application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model as defined in section 30-2.2 of this Subpart

(4) application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubric(s) selected by the district or BOCES for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice

(5) application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.

(6) application and use of any State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement used by the school district or BOCES to evaluate its teachers or principals

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

(8) the scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district or BOCES to evaluate a teacher or principal under this Subpart, including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings

(9) specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities

-
- Checked
-

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher's performance is being measured.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure that teachers will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

6.7) Assurances -- Data Assure that SED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data, and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with regulations, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.	Checked
6.7) Assurances -- Data Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.	Checked
6.7) Assurances -- Data Assure scores for all teachers will be reported to NYSED for each subcomponent, as well as the composite rating, as per NYSED requirements.	Checked

7. Growth on State Assessments or Comparable Measures (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Friday, April 26, 2013

Page 1

7.1) STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH (25 points with an approved Value-Added Measure)

For principals in buildings with Grades 4-8 ELA, Math and/or High School courses with State or Regents assessments, (or principals of programs with any of these assessments), NYSED will provide value-added measures. NYSED will also provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 25 points.

In order for a principal to receive a State-provided value-added measure, at least 30% of the students in the principal's school or program must take the applicable State or Regents assessments. This will include most schools in the State.

Value-Added measures will apply to schools or principals with the following grade configurations in this district (please list, e.g., K-5, PK-6, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12):

5-8
9-12
(No response)

7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth

Please check the boxes below:

7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth Assure that the value-added growth score provided by NYSED will be used, where applicable	Checked
7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth Assure that the State-provided growth measure will be used if a value-added measure has not been approved for 2012-13	Checked

7.3) STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

Student Learning Objectives will be the other comparable growth measures for principals in buildings or programs in which fewer than 30% of students take Grades 4-8 ELA, Math, and/or High School courses with State or Regents assessments. SLOs will be developed using the assessment covering the most students in the school or program and continuing until at least 30% of students in the school or program are covered by SLOs. District-determined assessments from the options below may be used as evidence of student learning within the SLO:

State assessments, *required if one exists*

District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

First, list the school or program type this SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the school/program listed. Finally, name the specific assessment listing the full name of the assessment. Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

Please remember that State assessments must be used with SLOs if applicable to the school or program type.

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
k-4 elementary	State assessment	3-4 grade NYS ELA and math Assessments

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The principal will receive the score for 4th grade students from SED and this will be averaged with the scores from third grade. The average will take into account any discrepancy between the number of 4th and 3rd graders in the building. The principals have agreed to use the formulas for point distribution found on the attached document for any SLO written. The SLO targets were mutually developed by the principal and the Superintendent based on student data and trends. The formulas provide that building principals can receive all points (from 0-20) and acknowledges that meeting the goal will equate to 13 points. The pages from our local APPR plan are attached below which provide the exact mathematical formulas developed to accomplish this.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Administrators in this category have a student body not only exceeding state-wide expectations for similar students, but also our own expectations for students. Typically, this district has higher expectations for student performance than the state or local BOCES. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	This administrator's building would be in the expected range for similar students both state-wide, BOCES-wide, and locally. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A principal in this range has a student body who is falling slightly below the expectations for state-wide, Boces-wide, and local similar students. Generally, a principal in this range would

be less than one standard deviation below the goal. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

A principal receiving a score in the ineffective range would have students performing more than one standard deviation below the established target goal. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning HEDI categories, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5365/130601-lha0DogRNw/PRINCIPAL II SLO FORMULAS FOR GROWTH SCORES.pdf

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in setting targets for Comparable Growth Measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

No adjustments or controls will be allowed

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

If educators have more than one state-provided growth or value-added measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI category and score for the growth subcomponent according to a formula determined by the Commissioner. (Examples: Principals of K-8 schools with growth measures for ELA and Math grades 4-8.)

If Principals have more than one SLO for comparable growth (or a State-provided growth measure and an SLO for comparable growth), the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points and Districts will weight each in proportion to the number of students covered by the SLO to reach a combined score for this subcomponent.

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html .	Checked

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

Locally comparable means that the same locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth must be used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district or BOCES.

Please note: only one locally-selected measure is required for principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations, but some districts may prefer to have more than one measure for principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations. This APPR form therefore provides space for multiple locally-selected measures for each principal in the same or similar program or grade configuration across the district. Therefore, if more than one locally-selected measure is used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration, districts must complete additional copies of this form and upload as attachments for review.

Also note: districts may use more than one locally-selected measure for **different** groups of principals **within the same or similar programs or grade configurations** if the district/BOCES prove comparability based on Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. If a district is choosing different measures for different groups of principals within the same or similar programs or grade configurations, they must complete additional copies of this form and upload as attachments for review.

8.1) LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT FOR PRINCIPALS WITH AN APPROVED VALUE-ADDED MEASURE (15 points)

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations used in your district or BOCES (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a local measure from the menu.

Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

- (a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8

- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)
- (h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
5-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	5th - 8th Grade District-wide Assessments in ELA and Math
9-12	(e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates	4 year Graduation Rate

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a principal to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a principal to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	Principals in our 5-8 buildings will have the results of the students' ELA and math points averaged together to get a building-wide average on the locally-selected measure(benchmark assessments) and this average will constitute their points (from 0-15) that will be awarded to them. This will be done by building. For the high school, the Superintendent will develop an expected graduate rate (in the form of a percentage) and the same formulas that were agreed to for all SLO's will be utilized to award points. The formulas are contained in the document attached below which comes from our district APPR plan (also attached to our application).
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Principals in this category have a student body not only exceeding state-wide expectations for similar students, but also our own expectations for students. Typically, this district has higher expectations for student performance than the state or local BOCES. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Principals in this category would be in the expected range for similar students both state-wide, BOCES-wide, and locally. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A principal in this range has a student body who is falling slightly below the expectations for state-wide, BOCES-wide, and local similar students. Generally, a principal in this range would be less than one standard deviation below the goal. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A principal receiving a score in the ineffective range would have students performing more than one standard deviation below the established target goal. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 8.1: Locally Selected Measures for Principals with an Approved Value-Added Measure" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 8.1. (MS Word)

(No response)

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning HEDI categories, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

<assets/survey-uploads/5366/130803-qBFVOWF7fC/PRINCIPAL LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES POINT ASSIGNMENT.pdf>

8.2) LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT FOR ALL OTHER PRINCIPALS (20 points)

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations used in your district or BOCES (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a local measure from the menu.

Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list: <!--

(a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)

(b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)

(c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8

(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations

(e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades

(f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades

(g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)

(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

(i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-4	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	3rd and 4th Grade District-Wide Benchmark Assessment

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a principal to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a principal to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	Principals in our K-4 buildings buildings will have the students' results on the ELA and math benchmark assessments averaged together to get a building-wide average on the locally-selected measure(benchmark assessments) and this average will constitute their points (from 0-20) that will be awarded to them. This will be done by building. The attached chart shows the exact point charts for % rates on locally-selected district-wide assessments that was agreed with the teachers' and the administarors' association.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Principals in this category have a student body not only exceeding state-wide expectations for similar students, but also our own expectations for students. Typically, this district has higher expectations for student performance than the state or local BOCES. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.</p>
<p>Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Principals in this category would have student performance in the expected range for similar students both state-wide, BOCES-wide, and locally. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>A principal in this range has a student body who is falling slightly below the expectations for state-wide, BOCES-wide, and local similar students. Generally, a principal in this range would be less than one standard deviation below the goal. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>A principal receiving a score in the ineffective range would have students performing more than one standard deviation below the established target goal. The formula attached below would be used to calculate the exact score of the principal.</p>

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 8.2: Locally Selected Measures for All Other Principals" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 8.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning HEDI categories, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

<assets/survey-uploads/5366/130803-T8MIGWUVm1/PRINCIPAL LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES POINT ASSIGNMENT.pdf>

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in setting targets for local measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

No special considerations or adjustments will be made.

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures where applicable for principals, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score.

Principals in K-4 and 5-8 will have all of the scores of the students on the locally-selected measure averaged together to give one final score and the same, negotiated point scale (see attached document) will be utilized to determine the principal's score (from 0-20 for 5-8 and 0-15 for K-4). All students taking the assessment will count equally toward the final average.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

8.5) Assurances	Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
8.5) Assurances	Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students, in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Check
8.5) Assurances	Assure that enrolled students are included in accordance with policies for student assignment to schools and may not be excluded.	Check
8.5) Assurances	Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Check
8.5) Assurances	Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Check
8.5) Assurances	Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.	Check
8.5) Assurances	Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.	Check
8.5) Assurances	If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Check
8.5) Assurances	Assure that all locally-selected measures for a principal are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Check

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 07, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

Select the choice of principal practice rubric from the menu of State-approved rubrics to assess performance based on ISLLC 2008 Standards. If your district has been granted a variance by NYSED through the variance process, select "district variance" from the menu. The "Second Rubric" space is optional. A district may use multiple rubrics, as long as the same rubric(s) is used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

State the number of points that will be assigned to each of the following measures, making sure that the points total 60. If you are not assigning any points to the "ambitious and measurable goals" measure, enter 0. Some districts may prefer to assign points differently for different groups of principals. This APPR form only provides one space for assigning points within other measures for principals. If your district/BOCES prefers to assign points differently for different groups of principals, enter the points assignment for one group of principals below. For the other group(s) of principals, fill out copies of this form and upload as an attachment for review. Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of principals covered:

(No response)

State the number of points that will be assigned to each of the following measures, making sure that the points total 60. If you are not assigning any points to the "ambitious and measurable goals" measure, enter 0.

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	60
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents.	0
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

If the above points assignment is not for "all principals," fill out an additional copy of "Form 9.2: Points Within Other Measures" for each group of principals, combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 9.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric.	(No response)
9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance).	(No response)

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

If you indicated above that one or more points will be assigned to the "ambitious and measurable goals" measure, identify at least two of the following sources of evidence that will be utilized as part of assessing every principal's goal(s):

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from teachers using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from students using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from families using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) School visits by other trained evaluators	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Review of school documents, records, and/or State accountability processes (all count as one source)	(No response)

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

If you indicated above that 1 or more points will be assigned to feedback using a State-approved survey tool, please check the box below:

(No response)

Note: When the State-approved survey list is posted, this form will be updated with dropdown menus of approved survey tools.

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

9.6) Assurances Assure that all ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards are assessed at least one time per year.	Checked
9.6) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for the "other measures" subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction	Checked

9.6) Assurances Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the "other measures" subcomponent.	Checked
9.6) Assurances Assure that the same rubric(s) is used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district or BOCES.	Checked

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

Describe the process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings using the principal practice rubric and/or any additional instruments used in the district. Include, if applicable, the process for combining results of multiple "other measures" into a single result for this subcomponent.

The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score is based on other measures of effectiveness consistent with ISSLC standards prescribed by the Commissioner in regulation. The District and the Association have agreed that the MultiDimensional Principal Performance Rubric will be utilized by the district to score this section of the evaluation.. The following six domains will each be worth ten (10) points toward the total possible score of 60 points:

- Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning*
- Domain 2: School Culture and Instructional Program*
- Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective, Learning Environment*
- Domain 4: Community*
- Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics*
- Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context*

- Highly Effective- 8-10 points*
- Effective : 5-7 points*
- Developing: 2-4 points*
- Ineffective: 0-1 points*

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

(No response)

Describe the level of performance required for each of the HEDI rating categories, consistent with the narrative descriptions in the regulations for the "other measures" subcomponent. Also describe how the points available within each HEDI category will be assigned.

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	In order for a principal to receive a highly effective rating in this section, the evidence collected must clearly demonstrate that the principal exceeds classroom expectations in the vast majority of indicators on the rubric. In order to get a score of 54 or higher in this section, the principal must exceed effectiveness in most, but not all, categories on the rubric.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	In order for a principal to receive an effective rating, the principal must score between 27-53 once all of the points are totaled. This would require that principals, through evidence collection, have demonstrated effectiveness in most, but not all of the key elements. A principal in this category may have some areas that are in the highly effective range but not enough to cause their rating (and point total) to place them at or above 54 points.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Evidence collection would point to a principal who is working towards, but has not accomplished, the expected competence in the key elements on the rubric. A score of 9-26 is considered in the developmental range.

A principal in this range will most likely have a PIP for the following year (assuming that their composite score was in the developing or ineffective range).

Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.

A principal who is showing great deficiencies in most, if not all, key elements on the rubric will receive a rating of 0-8. Through the agreed observation process, a principal receiving an ineffective score on this section would have little or no evidence that could be collected to show competence in most domains. Again, principals in this category will almost certainly have a PIP for the following school year (assuming a composite score in the developing or ineffective range).

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	54-60
Effective	27-53
Developing	9-26
Ineffective	0-8

9.8) School Visits

Enter the minimum number of school visits that will be done by each of the following evaluators, making sure that the number of visits "by supervisor" is at least 1 and the total number of visits is at least 2, for both probationary and tenured principals. If your APPR plan does not include visits by a trained administrator or independent evaluator, enter 0 in those boxes.

Probationary Principals

By supervisor	1
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	1
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 07, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are well above District- or BOCES- adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results meet District- or BOCES- adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are below District- or BOCES- adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Ineffective

Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are well below District- or BOCES- adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

For the 2013-2014 school year and beyond, the Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

10.1) The 2012-13 scoring ranges for principals for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness(60 points)

Overall Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

Insert district's or BOCES' negotiated HEDI scoring ranges for the Other Measures of Effectiveness Subcomponent (same as question 9.7), from 0 to 60 points

Highly Effective	54-60
Effective	27-53

Developing	9-26
Ineffective	0-8

10.2) The 2012-13 scoring ranges for principals for whom there is an approved Value-Added measure for student growth will be:

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness(60 points)

Overall Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans Assure that principals who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) within 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year	Checked
11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans Assure that PIPs shall include: identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas	Checked

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the PIP forms that are used in your school district or BOCES. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips.

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/130814-Df0w3Xx5v6/Administrator Improvement Plan - 5-29-12.pdf](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

Pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c, a principal may only challenge the following in an appeal:

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

(2) the school district's or BOCES' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c

(3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as well as the school district's or BOCES' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law section 3012-c

Describe the procedure for ensuring that appeals of annual performance evaluations will be handled in a timely and expeditious way:

Appeals process

To the extent that an Administrator (Principal, Associate Principal, Assistant Principal, Director) wishes to challenge a performance evaluation under the APPR Implementation Plan, the following appeals procedure referred to in Education Law 3012(c) has been established:

1. An Administrator may appeal only an overall Ineffective or Developing APPR rating. A rating within the rubric of Ineffective or Developing in and of itself is not appealable.
2. The summative evaluation meeting between the Administrator and Superintendent will take place no later than June 15th.
3. The Superintendent will provide a written evaluation and APPR rating within ten school days of the meeting for an Administrator receiving a rating of Ineffective or Developing.
4. Within ten school days of receipt of the written evaluation and APPR rating, the Administrator may make an informal appeal by presenting evidence, information and/or materials in writing to the Superintendent for consideration to upgrade the Ineffective or Developing rating to Developing or Effective, respectively.
5. Within five school days of receipt of the additional materials, the Superintendent will issue the final evaluation and APPR rating of the Administrator.
6. If the APPR rating is still Ineffective or Developing, the Administrator may begin the formal appeals process. This appeal must begin within ten school days of the Superintendent's written response to the informal appeal. If the Administrator is on vacation when the informal appeal response and final evaluation is issued, the ten school days will commence when the Administrator returns from vacation.
7. The formal appeal shall be in writing and shall detail the basis of the appeal.
8. The scope of the appeal may include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - a. The substance of the individual's written evaluation and/or APPR rating
 - b. The District's adherence to the negotiated evaluation system
9. A Principal/Administrator may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised within one appeal.
10. Timelines must be strictly adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement.
11. An independent evaluator, at the district's expense, will hear the appeal.
12. The independent evaluator shall issue a written determination within thirty school days of receipt of the written appeal and supporting documents. He/she may uphold, rescind, or revise the Ineffective or Developing rating.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

Describe the process by which evaluators will be trained and the process for how the district will certify and re-certify lead evaluators. Describe the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability. Describe the duration and nature of such training.

The Superintendent of Schools has attended training for principal evaluation and is the lead evaluator for all principal evaluation. The training was conducted by Jeffrey Craig, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction at OCM BOCES and lasted ten days. In addition to the focus listed below for all lead evaluators, this training included a focus on the ISSLC Standards and special considerations when observing building principals. Additionally, the Superintendent attended four additional days of training which was conducted by NYSCOSS. The Board of Education, at its June 4th meeting, approved a resolution certifying the Superintendent as Lead Evaluator for Principal evaluations. As lead evaluator for principal evaluations, the superintendent will attend regular updates provided by OCM BOCES for all Superintendents and will receive yearly recertification from our Board of Education.

All lead evaluators (for teachers) in Fayetteville-Manlius have attended ten sessions which covered the following information:

1. New York State Teaching Standards and Leadership Standards
2. Evidence-based observation
3. Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and VA Growth Model data
4. Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics
5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals
6. Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement
7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
8. Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals
9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of ELLs and students with disabilities

All training for building principals was under the direction of Jeffrey Gordon, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel and assisted by Jeffrey Craig, Assistant Superintendent of OCM BOCES. Each session lasted more than two hours and an emphasis was placed on collecting evidence and determining appropriate points on the NYSUT rubric. New building principals who will be utilized as lead evaluators will be required to attend sessions on the topics listed above and for the same duration of time before the Superintendent will allow them to be certified to conduct evaluations through APPR.

Next year, four 1/2 days are scheduled to continue to refine the inter-rater reliability. These will be held at OCM BOCES. The Superintendent will recertify lead evaluators yearly once attendance at these sessions is confirmed.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

(1) the New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable

(2) evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research

(3) application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model as defined in section 30-2.2 of this Subpart

(4) application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubric(s) selected by the district or BOCES for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice

(5) application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.

(6) application and use of any State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement used by the school district or BOCES to evaluate its teachers or principals

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

(8) the scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district or BOCES to evaluate a teacher or principal under this Subpart, including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings

(9) specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities

-
- Checked
-

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the building principal's performance is being measured.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure that the district will provide the principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of principal effectiveness subcomponent for a principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the principal is being measured.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure that principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

11.7) Assurances -- Data Assure that the NYSED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with this Subpart, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.	Checked
11.7) Assurances -- Data Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.	Checked
11.7) Assurances -- Data Assure scores for all principals will be reported to NYSED for each subcomponent, as well as the composite rating, as per NYSED requirements.	Checked

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Wednesday, May 01, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

Please obtain the required signatures, create a PDF file, and upload your joint certification of the APPR Plan using this form: APPR District Certification Form

<assets/survey-uploads/5581/125864-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Certification.pdf>

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

Microsoft Office (.doc, .ppt, .xls)

Microsoft Office 2007: Supported but not recommended (.docx, .pptx, .xlsx)

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

Other Formats (.html, .xhtml, .txt, .rtf, .latex)

Please note that .docx, .pptx, and .xlsx formats are not entirely supported.

Please save your file types as .doc, .ppt or .xls respectively before uploading.

Fayetteville-Manlius Central Schools
Annual Professional Performance Review Plan (APPR)
2012-13 School Year

Introduction

On May 28, 2010, the Governor signed Chapter 103 of the Laws of 2010, which added a new section 3012-c to the Education Law, establishing a comprehensive evaluation system for classroom teachers and building principals.

By September 1, 2011, the governing body of each school district and BOCES shall adopt a plan, which may be an annual or multi-year plan, for the annual professional performance review of its teachers providing instructional services or pupil personnel services.

This plan, jointly developed by the FMTA and the District, was designed to meet all required elements of Chapter 103 for the 2011-12 school year. Once approved by the governing body of the school district, the plan will be filed in the district office and posted to the district website no later than September 10th of each year.

For the 2011-2012 school year, the law only applies to classroom teachers of the common branch subjects, English language arts and/or mathematics in grades 4-8. Beginning in 2012-13, all teachers (as defined by law) will have the complete annual professional performance review (APPR) conducted annually.

Nothing in this plan shall be construed to affect the right of the Board of Education to terminate a probationary teacher or restrict the discretion of the Superintendent and/or Board of Education to make a determination on the status of a probationary teacher and/or deny tenure.

Teacher Evaluation

New York Teaching Standards

The professional performance review plan for teachers is based on the *New York State Teaching Standards*. These, therefore, are the criteria that will be used to evaluate teachers:

- **Knowledge of Students and Student Learning:** Teachers acquire knowledge of each student, and demonstrate knowledge of student development and learning to promote achievement for all students.
- **Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning:** Teachers know the content they are responsible for teaching, and plan instruction that ensures growth and achievement for all students.
- **Instructional Practice:** Teachers implement instruction that engages and challenges all students to meet or exceed the learning standards.
- **Learning Environment:** Teachers work with all students to create a dynamic learning environment that supports achievement and growth.

- **Assessment for Student Learning:** Teachers use multiple measures to assess and document student growth, evaluate instructional effectiveness, and modify instruction. This includes assessment techniques based on appropriate learning standards designed to measure students' progress in learning and that he or she successfully utilizes analysis of available student performance data (for example: State test results, student work, school-developed assessments, teacher-developed assessments, etc.) and other relevant information (for example: documented health or nutrition needs, or other student characteristics affecting learning) when providing instruction
- **Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration:** Teachers demonstrate professional responsibility and engage relevant stakeholders to maximize student growth, development, and learning. This includes the development of effective collaborative relationships with students, parents or caregivers, as needed, and appropriate support personnel to meet the learning needs of students; and
- **Professional Growth:** Teachers set informed goals and strive for continuous professional growth.

Teacher Effectiveness

Annual professional performance reviews shall differentiate teacher effectiveness using a composite effectiveness score. Based on such a composite effectiveness score a classroom teacher shall be rated as Highly Effective (91-100), Effective (75-90), Developing (65-74), or Ineffective (0-64). Additionally, the following table shows the State Determined HEDI ranges for the Growth (20%) and Locally Selected Measures (20%) sub-components, as well as the locally determined Other Measures (60%) sub-component (value-added percentage and HEDI ranges are also shown for those teachers that will receive a growth score based on the value-added model):

	Ia. Growth or Comparable Measure	Ib. For Teachers Receiving Value-Added Score	Ila. Locally Selected Measure of Growth or Achievement	Ilb. For Teachers Receiving a Value Added Score in Section I	III. Other Measures of Teacher Effectiveness
Highly Effective	18-20	22-25	18-20	14-15	54-60
Effective	9-17	10-21	9-17	8-13	27-53
Developing	3-8	3-9	3-8	3-7	9-26
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	0-2	0-2	0-8

Understanding Student Learning Objectives

What is a Student Learning Objective (SLO)? A student learning objective is an academic goal for a teacher's students that is set at the start of a course. It represents the most important learning for the year (or, semester, where applicable). It must be specific and measurable,

based on available prior student learning data, and aligned to Common Core, State, or national standards, as well as any other school and district priorities. Teachers' scores are based upon the degree to which their goals were attained.

Student Learning Objectives (also known as SLO's), are tools that may be utilized (subject dependent) to meet a teacher's requirements for the student growth measures and the locally-selected measures of the Annual Professional Performance Review.

The following is an example of an SLO for US History:

Population	Four sections of Regents US History (90 students)																				
Learning Content	NYS Learning Standards for Social Studies (History of the United States and New York, Standard 1)																				
Interval	2012-2013 School Year																				
Evidence	1. District-wide diagnostic assessment (June 2009 Regents US History Exam), which will be administered at the beginning of the school year 2. Regents US History examination will be used at the end of the year																				
Baseline	1. All of the students passed the Global Regents exam the previous year; 35% at mastery level (85% or higher) 2. The average score on the diagnostic assessment (June 2009 Regents) was 74%; 67% of the students scored at least a 65%; 21% of the students scored at least 85%.																				
Target(s) and HEDI scoring	50% of the students will score at least an 85% on the Regents exam given at the conclusion of the course.																				
	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	100-85%	80-84%	75-79%	70-74%	65-69%	60-64%	55-59%	50-54%	55-59%	51-54%	50-53%	49-52%	45-48%	41-44%	35-40%	30-34%	25-29%	20-24%	15-19%	10-14%	<10%
Rationale	Almost all students have historically passed the US History Regents examination. Increasing the number of students who achieve at the mastery in social studies is a school-wide goal. The average number of students scoring at the mastery level on US History for the district has been 50%. Because students have been learning US history for much of their education (4 th grade, 5 th grade, 7 th grade, 8 th grade), the use of a past Regents exam was appropriate as a diagnostic assessment.																				

It has been mutually agreed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association that all SLO target goals will be written in the form of a percentage to allow consistency and the use of a common formula for the calculation of point distribution, regardless of subject or level taught. Building principals, instructional specialists, department chairs, and subject coordinators will all be trained on the development of Student Learning Objectives. They will, in turn, assist their departments/buildings in the development and collection of SLO's.

According to New York State Education guidelines, SLO's are expected to be written by October 31st of the current school year.

The building principal will be responsible for providing feedback on any changes in the SLO's as necessary and will also be responsible for providing the teacher with his/her HEDI score on an SLO.

Student Growth Measures (State Assessment Scores)

20% of a teacher's overall score is based on student growth on State assessments or other comparable measures of student growth (25% for those teachers having a value-added calculation conducted). Student growth means the change in student achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. Student growth percentile score shall mean the result of a statistical model that calculates each student's change in achievement between two or more points in time on a State assessment or other comparable measure and compares each student's performance to that of similarly achieving students. Value-added growth score shall mean the result of a statistical model that incorporates a student's academic history and may use other student demographics and characteristics, school characteristics and/or teacher characteristics to isolate statistically the effect on student growth from those characteristics that are generally not in the teacher's or principal's control. Those teachers who will have a value-added model utilized will have 25% of their composite effectiveness score calculated from this section (rather than 20 percent).

4th-8th Grade ELA/Math Teachers: Data that are provided by SED will determine the number of points (out of the possible twenty (or twenty-five if a value added model is implemented)) toward the composite score a teacher will be awarded for the student growth portion. The state will assign a score of 0-20 (or 0-25) points for this subcomponent, which will contribute to the educator's composite effectiveness score using the standards and scoring ranges for this subcomponent as prescribed in regulation.

If more than 50% of a teacher's course load involves classes that have either a State assessment or a Regents exam given, that teacher's growth score will be derived from student achievement on these assessments (utilizing the SLO process).

For all other teachers, the growth score will be derived using the SLO process based on one of the following:

- Option One: District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments provided that the District or BOCES verifies comparability and rigor (common assessment)
- Option Two: Overall student results in that teacher's building based on State assessments.
- Option Three: 3rd Party vendor from approved State list

Decisions on which of the above options will be utilized by a grade/subject/department will be completed by May 1st of the previous school year so that it can be entered into the Review

Room portal which is required for the State Education Department. It is agreed that decisions regarding which option to choose must be agreed upon by the entire grade-level or department within a building. ***It has also been mutually agreed by the District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association that all SLO target goals will be written in the form of a percentage to allow consistency and the use of a common formula for the calculation of point distribution, regardless of subject or level taught.***

Methods for Assigning Points to the Growth Measure: The following is the agreed upon methods to provide a score for every teacher, regardless of the assessment chosen. The following ensures that all points (0-20) are possible scores for every teacher. Teachers who receive a value-added score from New York State will have a point total in this section from 0-25 points and, subsequently, will have their locally-selected measures point total in a range from 0-15 points.

State Provided Growth Score:

If a teacher receives a State provided growth or value-added score (primarily 4th-8th grade teachers of Language Arts and/or mathematics). ***If the State utilizes the value-added model, it is understood that this value-added score will be based out of twenty-five points instead of twenty and that these teachers will have their locally-selected measure (achievement) section decreased in value from twenty to fifteen points.***

Student Learning Objective (SLO):

1- If a teacher meets the agreed upon target goal established on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the teacher will receive a score of 13.

2- If the student scores exceed the established goal on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula will be used to determine the teacher's score (out of 20):

$$13 + (y-x)(7/100\%-x) = \text{growth score}$$

Where x = the established goal

y= the actual percentage of student achievement

(the number 7 in the above formula represents the number of possible remaining points that need to be proportionately allotted when a teacher exceeds the goal and therefore would receive more than the agreed upon goal point score of 13)

3- If the student scores fall below the established SLO goal (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula shall be used to determine the teacher's score:

$$13 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{Teacher growth score}$$

Where x= the established goal

y= the actual percentage of students achievement

(the 13 in 13/x represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

(the number "13" in 13/x represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

Assessments will be secure and not disseminated to students prior to the assessment administration. Teachers will not score their own students' (except in a randomized scoring system) work if the results of the assessments will factor into their score.

Student Achievement Measures (Locally selected measure)

20% of the composite effectiveness score is based on locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers who received a growth score derived from a value-added model, this section will constitute 15% of their composite effectiveness score.

Departments/district-wide grade levels may choose either option below:

Option One: Administer a district-wide developed/approved assessment for all students in that subject/grade level. A teacher's score on this section will be determined by the percentage of students achieving the district approved cut score.

Option Two: Use a 3rd party assessment from the 3rd party vendor list provided by the State Education Department. In option one and two, the district will determine an appropriate cut score and a teacher's score will be determined by calculating the percentage of the class that met or exceeded the cut score (see scoring section below for allotment of points).

Option Three: Write a new SLO that is aligned to the same assessment as was chosen for the growth measure above but has a different student goal than was written for the growth SLO. For example:

- a third grade teacher may have a growth SLO goal that addresses the percentage of students expected to receive a score of 3 or higher on the 3rd grade State ELA assessment and might have a locally-selected measure SLO goal of the percentage of students expected to receive a level 4 on the same assessment.

Option Four: Give a different district, regional, or BOCES approved assessment and write a new SLO goal statement related to that assessment

Decisions on which of the above options will be utilized by a grade/subject/department will be completed by May 1st of the previous school year so that it can be entered into the Review Room portal which is required for the State Education Department. It is agreed that decisions regarding which option to choose must be agreed upon by the entire grade-level or department/subject within a building. ***It has also been mutually agreed by the District and***

the Fayetteville-Manlius Teachers' Association that all SLO target goals will be written in the form of a percentage to allow consistency and the use of a common formula for the calculation of point distribution, regardless of subject or level taught.

Assigning Points for the Locally-Selected Measure/Student Achievement Section of the APPR :

The following is the agreed upon methods to provide a score for every teacher, regardless of the assessment chosen. The following ensures that all points (0-20)(or in the case of value – added 15 points) are possible scores for every teacher. The Value-Added formula is for those teachers who will have only fifteen points allotted to this section due to the fact that their value-added score from the state will be based out of twenty-five.

Student Learning Objective (SLO):

1- If a teacher meets the agreed upon goal established on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the teacher will receive a score of thirteen (13). For teachers who have received a growth score out of twenty five (due to the fact that their growth score was derived from a value-added model), meeting the established goal on the SLO will provide them with a score of ten.

2- If the student scores exceed the established goal on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula will be used to determine the teacher's score (out of 20):

$$13 + (y-x)(7/100\%-x) = \text{teacher's point total for this section}$$

Where x = the established goal

y= the actual percentage of student achievement

(the number 7 in the above formula represents the number of possible remaining points that need to be proportionately allotted when a teacher exceeds the goal and therefore would receive more than the agreed upon goal point score of 13)

***** For teachers receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a teacher exceeding the established goal on the SLO:***

$$10 + (y-z) (5/100\%-x) = \text{Teacher's point total for this section}$$

- 3- If the student scores fall below the established SLO goal (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula shall be used to determine the teacher's score:

$$13 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{Teacher's point total for this section}$$

Where x= the established goal

y= the actual percentage of students achievement

(the 13 in 13/x represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

(the number "13" in 13/x represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

**** For teachers receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a teacher exceeding the established goal on the SLO:**

$$10 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{teacher's point total for this section}$$

Benchmarks Assessments (district developed or 3rd party vendor):

Any and all benchmark assessments utilized for this section will be reviewed by the District to ensure that they meet validity standards and are rigorous. Cut scores will then be determined by the district's curriculum and instruction office. These cut scores will be utilized as the basis to

compare and assign points to individual teachers. The following formulas and chart will be used for all assessments falling into this category:

STUDENTS MEETING CUT SCORE

(for teachers receiving a Growth Score out of twenty)

100%	20
95-99%	19
90-94%	18
85-89%	17
80-84%	16
75-79%	15
70-74%	14
65-69%	13
60-64%	12
55-59%	11
50-54%	10
45-49%	9
40-44%	8
35-39%	7
30-34%	6
25-29%	5
20-24%	4
15-19%	3
10-14%	2
5-9%	1
0-4%	0

Students Meeting Cut Score

(for teacher's receiving a value added score from New York State)

100%	15
93-99%	14
86-92%	13
79-85%	12
72-78%	11
65-71%	10
58-64%	9
51-57%	8
44-50%	7
37-43%	6
30-36%	5
23-29%	4
16-22%	3
9-15%	2
2-8%	1
0-2%	0

Assessments will be secure and not disseminated to students prior to the assessment administration. Teachers will not score their own students (except in a randomized scoring system) work if the results of the assessments will factor into their score.

Multiple Measures of Effectiveness

The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score is based on other measures of teacher effectiveness consistent with standards prescribed by the Commissioner in regulation. The District and the Association have agreed that the New York State United Teachers' Rubric will be utilized by the district to score this section of the evaluation. In order to support continuous professional growth, classroom observations, which consist of a combination of longer (period-length) and shorter (classroom visits and walk-throughs) observations, will be conducted for all teachers. The standards of Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration (Standard 6) and Professional Growth (Standard 7) will also be evaluated by the administrator as part of the summary evaluation at the end of the school year. The following seven standards will each be worth the following points toward the total possible score of 60 points:

Standard 1: Knowledge of Students and Student Learning (8 points)

Standard 2: Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning (10 points)

Standard 3: Instructional Practice (10 points)

Standard 4: Learning Environment (6 points)

Standard 5: Assessment for Student Learning (8 points)

Standard 6: Professional Responsibilities (10 points)

Standard 7: Professional Growth (8 points)

For the *evidence* gathered through the observations and the review of Standard 6 and 7, the teacher will receive points for each key element as follows:

Highly effective – 2.0

Effective – 1.5

Developing – 1.0

Ineffective - 0

Evaluator Training

The superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes.

The superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or recertification, as applicable, shall not conduct evaluations. Any Lead evaluator who does not complete certification may not train local evaluators.

Data Linkage

Working with the Central New York Regional Information Center, the district will provide all of the data elements described by SED. Data will be submitted to the SED through the portal each year.

Teachers will also be responsible for utilizing the State's PIN system for review of student rosters. All teachers will be asked to review their student rosters between April and May of each school year. A teacher will then complete the sign-off form and turn it in to the building principal. If the teacher feels that changes need to be made, there is room on the form to address that. If the teacher feels that the student roster is correct, he/she simply signs and returns it to the principal.

Professional Improvement Plans

For teachers receiving an ineffective or developing rating, a teacher Improvement Plan is required to be written. The principal is required to present a draft of the TIP within 10 business days of the teacher receiving his/her ineffective or developing rating. Once the draft is presented, the teacher will have an opportunity to review the TIP and make suggestions for revisions, additions, or deletions. Once completed, the document will be signed by both the principal and teacher and implemented immediately. As has been consistent practice at Fayetteville-Manlius, the individual teacher may request that an association representative be present for any discussion regarding a Teacher Improvement Plan.

A teacher improvement plan should include the areas of needed improvement, the expectations by the district, the timeframe for review and evaluation of expectations, and what resources, if any, the district will make available to the teacher. An example of the Fayetteville-Manlius TIP plan can be found in the Appendix section of this document.

Appeals

The district and association agree that no decisions with monetary implications will be derived from a teacher's rating of either effective or highly effective. Therefore, teachers will be afforded the opportunity to write a written response to be added to the annual evaluation if their score indicates either of these two scores.

If a tenured teacher receives a rating of developing or ineffective, they will have the right to complete the appeal form if the following conditions have been met:

- 1) The teacher has a specific area noted on the evaluation that he/she has documented proof is inaccurate

-and-

- 2) The maximum number of points that this discrepancy represents has the potential to move the individual's total points to a range of a higher ranking.

-or-

- 1) If the individual has documentation to show that the procedures required in the APPR were not followed.

In this case, tenured teachers may complete the appeal form. The form will first go to the principal of the building for review. If the principal agrees that an error has been made, the changes can be made immediately. If the building principal disagrees with the documentation provided, he/she will let the individual know of their decision and the teacher will then have the right to send the same documentation and form to the Superintendent for review. The Superintendent, or his/her designee, will review the documentation provided and have the right to make the changes to the teacher's score. If he/she disagrees with the documentation, or finds that the documentation does not prove the information inaccurate in the evaluation, he/she may deny the appeal. In this case, the teacher will have the right to add a response to his/her file which will be kept with the annual evaluation in the teachers personnel file.

Non-tenured teachers will have the right to add a response to the annual evaluation which will be kept in his/her personnel file with the annual evaluation.

Additional Documents

Appendices

Teacher Improvement Plan:

Date:

To

Re: Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

Dear:

Based on your summative evaluation rating of **ineffective/developing** for the 20__ / 20__ school year, this letter is intended to inform you of the need for a **Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)**. This letter will also advise you with regard to the plan components.

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Team – Teacher Improvement Plans shall be developed in consultation with the administrator(s) and you. You are also allowed to have union representation during this process. The following administrators will serve as members of your Teacher Improvement Plan and will be responsible for assessing and evaluating your progress under your Plan:

•
•
•
•

Development of the Plan – Although this letter will address specific areas of concern, and will propose particular remedial steps, the Plan will be most effective if it is the result of your careful consideration and input}. You have the right, on the following page, to add additional remediation and modification to this plan. Once your input is completed, a final TIP Plan will be completed.

Identify Areas for Improvement – The proposed Teacher Improvement Plan should address the following concerns:

•
•
•
•

Strategies for Improvement – The Teacher Improvement Plan should include specific steps by which your skills may be improved. These steps will be primarily your personal responsibility. You are encouraged to consider what additional steps would be helpful to you, and to include those steps in your proposal.

•
•
•
•

Timeline for Achieving Improvement – Will be at the end of the 20__ school year. Progress monitoring dates for this plan will be determined at the initial Team Meeting

Measures in which Improvement will be Assessed – Your lead evaluator will be required to review your progress based on evidence he/she has collected, as well as the information you have collected as evidence of improvement in the above stated areas.

If there are other resources that you believe would be helpful to you in developing and implementing a meaningful Teacher Improvement Plan, please do not hesitate to attach them to the next page for review by the lead evaluator.

Please sign where indicated below and return to the Office of Human Resources no later than _____. Your signature serves as acknowledgement of the following:

- You received this letter
- You understand that you will be on a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) for the 20__-20__ school year
- The attached document is for you to add or make suggested modifications to the information outlined above.
- A copy of this Teacher Improvement Plan will be placed in your personnel file

If you have questions, please feel welcome to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Gordon
Assistant Superintendent for Personnel

Signature: _____

{TEACHER}

PROGRESS MONITORING DOCUMENTATION

Meeting 1: Summary and discussion notes:

Meeting 2: Summary and discussion notes:

Meeting 3: Summary and discussion notes:

Meeting 4: Summary and discussion notes:

Appeal Form:

Fayetteville-Manlius CSD
Annual Professional Performance Review Appeal Process
2012-13

According to the appeals process in the District approved Annual Professional Performance Review, No teacher receiving an “effective” or “highly effective” rating may appeal for any reason. Also, Non-tenured teachers are not entitled to a formal appeal. Instead they may write a response which will be included in their personnel file with the evaluation. Any written response must be provided to the school principal no more than ten (10) weekdays after the teacher receives the evaluation.

If a tenured teacher receives a rating of “developing” or “ineffective”, they will have the right to complete the appeal form if the following conditions have been met:

- 3) The teacher has a specific area noted on the evaluation that he/she has documented proof is inaccurate (i.e., a formal document from the administrator) -and-
- 4) The maximum number of points that this discrepancy represents has the potential to move the individuals total points to a range of a higher ranking. -or-
- 2) If the individual has documentation to show that the procedures required in the APPR were not followed.

Please note that the district has no discretion on Part I of the evaluation (student growth). This score comes directly from New York State Education Department and no appeal of this number is allowed through a local appeal process.

Name _____ Subject or Grade _____

I am appealing the following section of the evaluation (please remember this is no appeal of Section I- Student Growth):

____ I have attached proof to demonstrate that the score on this section is inaccurate

____ The maximum number of points that a change in this section would provide would cause my rating to change

Signature of Teacher:

Date:

Assigning Points for the Growth or Comparable Measure Section of APPR:

State Provided Growth Score:

If a teacher receives a State provided growth or value-added score (primarily 4th-8th grade teachers of Language Arts and/or mathematics) that score will be the point total (out of twenty) for the Growth or Comparable Measure section of APPR. If a teacher receives multiple scores from the State and they are not already combined, the numbers will be averaged together but will take into account the variation of students taking one assessment over another. ***If the State utilizes the value-added model, it is understood that this value-added score will be based out of twenty-five points instead of twenty and that these teachers will have their locally-selected measure (achievement) section decreased in value from twenty to fifteen points.***

Student Learning Objective (SLO):

1- If a teacher meets the agreed upon target goal established on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the teacher will receive a score of 13.

2- If the student scores exceed the established goal on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula will be used to determine the teacher's score (out of 20):

$$13 + (y-x)(7/100\%-x) = \text{growth score}$$

Where x = the established goal

y= the actual percentage of student achievement

(the number 7 in the above formula represents the number of possible remaining points that need to be proportionately allotted when a teacher exceeds the goal and therefore would receive more than the agreed upon goal point score of 13)

3- If the student scores fall below the established SLO target goal (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula shall be used to determine the teacher's score:

$$13 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{Teacher growth score}$$

Where x= the established goal

y= the actual percentage of students achievement

(the 13 in 13/x represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

(the number "13" in 13/x represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

Assessments will be secure and not disseminated to students prior to the assessment administration. Teachers will not score their own students' (except in a randomized scoring system) work if the results of the assessments will factor into their score.

Assigning Points for the Locally-Selected Measure/Student Achievement Section of the APPR :

The following is the agreed upon methods to provide a score for every teacher, regardless of the assessment chosen. The following ensures that all points (0-20)(or in the case of value – added 15 points) are possible scores for every teacher. The Value-Added formula is for those teachers who will have only fifteen points allotted to this section due to the fact that their value-added score from the state will be based out of twenty-five.

Student Learning Objective (SLO):

1- If a teacher meets the agreed upon goal established on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the teacher will receive a score of thirteen (13). For teachers who have received a growth score out of twenty five (due to the fact that their growth score was derived form a value-added model), meeting the established goal on the SLO will provide them with a score of ten.

2- If the student scores exceed the established goal on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula will be used to determine the teacher's score (out of 20):

$$13 + (y-x)(7/100\%-x) = \text{teacher's point total for this section}$$

Where x = the established goal

y= the actual percentage of student achievement

(the number 7 in the above formula represents the number of possible remaining points that need to be proportionately allotted when a teacher exceeds the goal and therefore would receive more than the agreed upon goal point score of 13)

***** For teachers receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a teacher exceeding the established goal on the SLO:***

$$10 + (y-x) (5/100\%-x) = \text{Teacher's point total for this section}$$

- 3- If the student scores fall below the established SLO goal (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula shall be used to determine the teacher's score:

$$13 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{Teacher's point total for this section}$$

Where x = the established goal

y = the actual percentage of students achievement

(the 13 in $13/x$ represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

(the number "13" in $13/x$ represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

**** For teachers receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a teacher falling below the established goal on the SLO:**

$$10 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{teacher's point total for this section}$$

Benchmarks Assessments (district developed or 3rd party vendor):

Any and all benchmark assessments utilized for this section will be reviewed by the District to ensure that they meet validity standards and are rigorous. Cut scores will then be determined by the district's curriculum and instruction office. These cut scores will be utilized as the basis to compare and assign points to individual teachers. The following formulas and chart will be used for all assessments falling into this category:

STUDENTS MEETING CUT SCORE

(for teachers receiving a Growth Score out of twenty)

100%	20
95-99%	19
90-94%	18
85-89%	17
80-84%	16
75-79%	15
70-74%	14
65-69%	13
60-64%	12
55-59%	11
50-54%	10
45-49%	9
40-44%	8
35-39%	7
30-34%	6
25-29%	5
20-24%	4
15-19%	3
10-14%	2
5-9%	1
0-4%	0

Students Meeting Cut Score

(for teacher's receiving a value added score from New York State)

100%	15
93-99%	14
86-92%	13
79-85%	12
72-78%	11
65-71%	10
58-64%	9
51-57%	8
44-50%	7
37-43%	6
30-36%	5
23-29%	4
16-22%	3
9-15%	2
3-8%	1
0-2%	0

Assessments will be secure and not disseminated to students prior to the assessment administration. Teachers will not score their own students (except in a randomized scoring system) work if the results of the assessments will factor into their score.

Assigning Points for the Locally-Selected Measure/Student Achievement Section of the APPR :

The following is the agreed upon methods to provide a score for every teacher, regardless of the assessment chosen. The following ensures that all points (0-20)(or in the case of value – added 15 points) are possible scores for every teacher. The Value-Added formula is for those teachers who will have only fifteen points allotted to this section due to the fact that their value-added score from the state will be based out of twenty-five.

Student Learning Objective (SLO):

1- If a teacher meets the agreed upon goal established on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the teacher will receive a score of thirteen (13). For teachers who have received a growth score out of twenty five (due to the fact that their growth score was derived form a value-added model), meeting the established goal on the SLO will provide them with a score of ten.

2- If the student scores exceed the established goal on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula will be used to determine the teacher's score (out of 20):

$$13 + (y-x)(7/100\%-x) = \text{teacher's point total for this section}$$

Where x = the established goal

y= the actual percentage of student achievement

(the number 7 in the above formula represents the number of possible remaining points that need to be proportionately allotted when a teacher exceeds the goal and therefore would receive more than the agreed upon goal point score of 13)

***** For teachers receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a teacher exceeding the established goal on the SLO:***

$$10 + (y-x) (5/100\%-x) = \text{Teacher's point total for this section}$$

- 3- If the student scores fall below the established SLO goal (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula shall be used to determine the teacher's score:

$$13 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{Teacher's point total for this section}$$

Where x = the established goal

y = the actual percentage of students achievement

(the 13 in $13/x$ represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

(the number "13" in $13/x$ represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

**** For teachers receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a teacher falling below the established goal on the SLO:**

$$10 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{teacher's point total for this section}$$

Benchmarks Assessments (district developed or 3rd party vendor):

Any and all benchmark assessments utilized for this section will be reviewed by the District to ensure that they meet validity standards and are rigorous. Cut scores will then be determined by the district's curriculum and instruction office. These cut scores will be utilized as the basis to compare and assign points to individual teachers. The following formulas and chart will be used for all assessments falling into this category:

STUDENTS MEETING CUT SCORE

(for teachers receiving a Growth Score out of twenty)

100%	20
95-99%	19
90-94%	18
85-89%	17
80-84%	16
75-79%	15
70-74%	14
65-69%	13
60-64%	12
55-59%	11
50-54%	10
45-49%	9
40-44%	8
35-39%	7
30-34%	6
25-29%	5
20-24%	4
15-19%	3
10-14%	2
5-9%	1
0-4%	0

Students Meeting Cut Score

(for teacher's receiving a value added score from New York State)

100%	15
93-99%	14
86-92%	13
79-85%	12
72-78%	11
65-71%	10
58-64%	9
51-57%	8
44-50%	7
37-43%	6
30-36%	5
23-29%	4
16-22%	3
9-15%	2
3-8%	1
0-2%	0

Assessments will be secure and not disseminated to students prior to the assessment administration. Teachers will not score their own students (except in a randomized scoring system) work if the results of the assessments will factor into their score.

PRINCIPAL SLO FORMULAS FOR GROWTH SCORES:

For building principals who will not receive a value added score or growth score directly from New York State, building SLO's must be written starting with SLO targets for New York State Assessments until 30% of the students have been reached.

The following formulas, similar to those written for teachers, have been agreed to ensure that all possible points are attainable and fairly distributed regardless of the target chosen. The District and the Fayetteville-Manlius Administrators' Association agree that all SLO's written will be in the form of a percent. Meeting the established SLO target results in a score of 13 (on a scale of 0-20).

If the principal scores exceed the established goal on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula will be used to determine the principal's score (out of 20):

$$13 + (y-x)(7/100\%-x) = \text{growth score}$$

Where x = the established goal

y= the actual percentage of student achievement

(the number 7 in the above formula represents the number of possible remaining points that need to be proportionately allotted when a principal exceeds the goal and therefore would receive more than the agreed upon goal point score of 13)

3- If the student scores fall below the established SLO goal (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula shall be used to determine the principal's score:

$$13 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{growth score}$$

Where x= the established goal

y= the actual percentage of students achievement

(the 13 in 13/x represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

(the number "13" in 13/x represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

Assigning Points for the Locally-Selected Measure/Student Achievement Section of the APPR for Principals :

The following is the agreed upon methods to provide a score for principals, regardless of the assessment chosen. The following ensures that all points (0-20)(or in the case of value –added 15 points) are possible scores for every teacher. The Value-Added formula is for those principals who will have only fifteen points allotted to this section due to the fact that their value-added score from the state will be based out of twenty-five.

Student Learning Objective (SLO):

1- If a principal meets the agreed upon goal established on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the principal will receive a score of thirteen (13). For principals who have received a growth score out of twenty five (due to the fact that their growth score was derived form a value-added model), meeting the established goal on the SLO will provide them with a score of ten (10).

2- If the student scores exceed the established goal on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula will be used to determine the principal's score (out of 20):

$$13 + (y-x)(7/100\%-x) = \text{principal's point total for this section}$$

Where x = the established goal

y= the actual percentage of student achievement

(the number 7 in the above formula represents the number of possible remaining points that need to be proportionately allotted when a principal exceeds the goal and therefore would receive more than the agreed upon goal point score of 13)

***** For principals receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a principal exceeding the established goal on the SLO:***

$$10 + (y-x) (5/100\%-x) = \text{principal's point total for this section}$$

3- If the student scores fall below the established SLO goal (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula shall be used to determine the principal's score:

$$13 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{principal's point total for this section}$$

Where x = the established goal

y = the actual percentage of students achievement

(the 13 in $13/x$ represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

(the number "13" in $13/x$ represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

**** For principals receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a teacher falling below the established goal on the SLO:**

$$10 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{principal's point total for this section}$$

Benchmarks Assessments (district developed or 3rd party vendor):

Any and all benchmark assessments utilized for this section will be reviewed by the District to ensure that they meet validity standards and are rigorous. Cut scores will then be determined by the district's curriculum and instruction office. These cut scores will be utilized as the basis to compare and assign points to building principals based on the entire student body taking the assessment. The following formulas and chart will be used for all assessments falling into this category:

STUDENTS MEETING CUT SCORE

(for principals receiving a Growth Score out of twenty)

100%	20
95-99%	19
90-94%	18
85-89%	17
80-84%	16
75-79%	15
70-74%	14
65-69%	13
60-64%	12
55-59%	11
50-54%	10
45-49%	9
40-44%	8
35-39%	7
30-34%	6
25-29%	5
20-24%	4
15-19%	3
10-14%	2
5-9%	1
0-4%	0

Students Meeting Cut Score

(for principals receiving a value added score from New York State)

100%	15
93-99%	14
86-92%	13
79-85%	12
72-78%	11
65-71%	10
58-64%	9
51-57%	8
44-50%	7
37-43%	6
30-36%	5
23-29%	4
16-22%	3
9-15%	2
3-8%	1
0-2%	0

Assessments will be secure and not disseminated to students prior to the assessment administration. Principals will ensure that teachers will not score their own students (except in a randomized scoring system) work if the results of the assessments will factor into their score.

Assigning Points for the Locally-Selected Measure/Student Achievement Section of the APPR for Principals :

The following is the agreed upon methods to provide a score for principals, regardless of the assessment chosen. The following ensures that all points (0-20)(or in the case of value –added 15 points) are possible scores for every teacher. The Value-Added formula is for those principals who will have only fifteen points allotted to this section due to the fact that their value-added score from the state will be based out of twenty-five.

Student Learning Objective (SLO):

1- If a principal meets the agreed upon goal established on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the principal will receive a score of thirteen (13). For principals who have received a growth score out of twenty five (due to the fact that their growth score was derived form a value-added model), meeting the established goal on the SLO will provide them with a score of ten (10).

2- If the student scores exceed the established goal on the SLO (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula will be used to determine the principal's score (out of 20):

$$13 + (y-x)(7/100\%-x) = \text{principal's point total for this section}$$

Where x = the established goal

y= the actual percentage of student achievement

(the number 7 in the above formula represents the number of possible remaining points that need to be proportionately allotted when a principal exceeds the goal and therefore would receive more than the agreed upon goal point score of 13)

***** For principals receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a principal exceeding the established goal on the SLO:***

$$10 + (y-x) (5/100\%-x) = \text{principal's point total for this section}$$

3- If the student scores fall below the established SLO goal (must be in the form of a percentage), the following formula shall be used to determine the principal's score:

$$13 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{principal's point total for this section}$$

Where x = the established goal

y = the actual percentage of students achievement

(the 13 in $13/x$ represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

(the number "13" in $13/x$ represents the points from 0 to 12 that need to be given a value and subtracted from the goal score of 13)

**** For principals receiving a value added score (out of twenty-five) in the Growth/Value added section, the following formula must be used for determining the point total for a teacher falling below the established goal on the SLO:**

$$10 - (x-y)(13/x) = \text{principal's point total for this section}$$

Benchmarks Assessments (district developed or 3rd party vendor):

Any and all benchmark assessments utilized for this section will be reviewed by the District to ensure that they meet validity standards and are rigorous. Cut scores will then be determined by the district's curriculum and instruction office. These cut scores will be utilized as the basis to compare and assign points to building principals based on the entire student body taking the assessment. The following formulas and chart will be used for all assessments falling into this category:

STUDENTS MEETING CUT SCORE

(for principals receiving a Growth Score out of twenty)

100%	20
95-99%	19
90-94%	18
85-89%	17
80-84%	16
75-79%	15
70-74%	14
65-69%	13
60-64%	12
55-59%	11
50-54%	10
45-49%	9
40-44%	8
35-39%	7
30-34%	6
25-29%	5
20-24%	4
15-19%	3
10-14%	2
5-9%	1
0-4%	0

Students Meeting Cut Score

(for principals receiving a value added score from New York State)

100%	15
93-99%	14
86-92%	13
79-85%	12
72-78%	11
65-71%	10
58-64%	9
51-57%	8
44-50%	7
37-43%	6
30-36%	5
23-29%	4
16-22%	3
9-15%	2
3-8%	1
0-2%	0

Assessments will be secure and not disseminated to students prior to the assessment administration. Principals will ensure that teachers will not score their own students (except in a randomized scoring system) work if the results of the assessments will factor into their score.

Administrator Improvement Plan

Administrator

Date of improvement plan meeting

Building

Date of progress check-in

Superintendent/Designee

Date of final assessment of plan

Area(s)/standard(s) in need of improvement

Training opportunities/professional learning activities

Indicators of improvement/assessment

Timeline of improvement plan including frequency of check-ins and final review

Superintendent/Designee Signature: _____

Date: _____

Principal/Administrator Signature: _____

Date: _____

FAYETTEVILLE-MANLIUS CENTRAL SCHOOLS

8199 EAST SENECA TURNPIKE
MANLIUS, NEW YORK

Date:

To

Re: Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

Dear:

Based on your summative evaluation rating of **improving/developing** for the 20__ / 20__ school year, this letter is intended to inform you of the need for a **Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)**. This letter will also advise you with regard to the plan components.

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Team – Teacher Improvement Plans shall be developed in consultation with the administrator(s) and you. You are also allowed to have union representation during this process. The following administrators will serve as members of your Teacher Improvement Plan and will be responsible for assessing and evaluating your progress under your Plan:

•
•
•
•

Development of the Plan – Although this letter will address specific areas of concern, and will propose particular remedial steps, the Plan will be most effective if it is the result of your careful consideration and input. You have the right, on the following page, to add additional remediations and modification to this plan. Once your input is completed, a final TIP Plan will be completed.

Identify Areas for Improvement – The proposed Teacher Improvement Plan should address the following concerns:

•
•
•
•

Strategies for Improvement – The Teacher Improvement Plan should include specific steps by which your skills may be improved. These steps will be primarily your personal responsibility. You are encouraged to consider what additional steps would be helpful to you, and to include those steps in your proposal.

•
•

FAYETTEVILLE-MANLIUS CENTRAL SCHOOLS

8199 EAST SENECA TURNPIKE
MANLIUS, NEW YORK

•
•

Timeline for Achieving Improvement – Will be at the end of the 20__ school year. Progress monitoring dates for this plan will be determined at the initial Team Meeting

Measures in which Improvement will be Assessed – Your lead evaluator will be required to review your progress based on evidence he/she has collected, as well as the information you have collected as evidence of improvement in the above stated areas.

If there are other resources that you believe would be helpful to you in developing and implementing a meaningful Teacher Improvement Plan, please do not hesitate to attach them to the next page for review by the lead evaluator.

Please sign where indicated below and return to the Office of Human Resources no later than _____. Your signature serves as acknowledgement of the following:

- You received this letter
- You understand that you will be on a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) for the 20__-20__ school year
- The attached document is for you to add or make suggested modifications to the information outlined above.
- A copy of this Teacher Improvement Plan will be placed in your personnel file

If you have questions, please feel welcome to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Gordon
Assistant Superintendent for Personnel

Signature: _____
{TEACHER}

FAYETTEVILLE-MANLIUS CENTRAL SCHOOLS

8199 EAST SENECA TURNPIKE
 MANLIUS, NEW YORK

Teacher Improvement Plan Document
Teacher Additions/Suggested Modifications

I wish to add or modify the following information contained in eth preliminary Teacher Improvement Plan:

Teacher Improvement Team

•
•
•
•

Strategies for Improvement

•
•
•
•

Progress Monitoring Dates

•
•
•
•

Measures in which Improvement will be Assessed

Areas For Improvement	Key Measures

Please attach any additional resources or information you believe would be useful to this document when returning to the Lead evaluator.

Signature: _____
 {Teacher} Date

Signature: _____
 {Lead Evaluator} Date

FAYETTEVILLE-MANLIUS CENTRAL SCHOOLS

8199 EAST SENECA TURNPIKE
MANLIUS, NEW YORK

PROGRESS MONITORING DOCUMENTATION

Meeting 1: Summary and discussion notes:

Meeting 2: Summary and discussion notes:

Meeting 3: Summary and discussion notes:

Meeting 4: Summary and discussion notes:

DISTRICT CERTIFICATION FORM: Please download this form, sign and upload to APPR form

By signing this document, the school district or BOCES certifies that this document constitutes the district's or BOCES' complete Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Plan, that all provisions of the APPR that are subject to collective negotiations have been resolved pursuant to the provisions of Article 14 of the Civil Service Law and that such APPR Plan complies with the requirements of Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents and has been adopted by the governing body of the school district or BOCES. By signing this document, the collective bargaining agent(s) of the school district or BOCES, where applicable, certify that this document constitutes the district's or BOCES' complete Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Plan, that collective negotiations have been completed on all provisions of the APPR that are subject to collective bargaining, and that such APPR Plan complies with the requirements of Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents and has been adopted by the governing body of the school district or BOCES.

The school district or BOCES and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also certify that upon information and belief, all statements made herein are true and accurate and that any applicable collective bargaining agreements for teachers and principals are consistent with and/or have been amended and/or modified or otherwise resolved to the extent required by Article 14 of the Civil Service Law, as necessary to require that all classroom teachers and building principals will be evaluated using a comprehensive annual evaluation system that rigorously adheres to Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

The school district or BOCES and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also make the following specific certifications with respect to their APPR Plan:

- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher and principal development
- Assure that the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's or principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's or principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured
- Assure that the APPR plan will be posted on the district's or BOCES' website by September 10 or within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner, whichever is later
- Assure that accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that the district or BOCES will report the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner
- Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities
- Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a TIP or PIP plan, in accordance with the regulations, as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with the regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal
- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and that the APPR Plan describes the process for assigning points for each subcomponent
- Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms (for teachers, the same locally-selected measure is used across a subject and/or grade level; for principals, the same locally-selected measure must be used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration)

- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that the process for assigning points for all subcomponents and the composite scores will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction
- Assure that district or BOCES will develop SLOs according to the rules and/or guidance established by SED and that past academic performance and / or baseline academic data of students is taken into account when developing an SLO
- Assure that Student Growth/Value Added Measure will be used where applicable
- Assure that any material changes to this APPR Plan will be submitted to the Commissioner for approval as soon as practicable and/or in a timeframe prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that this APPR Plan applies to all classroom teachers and building principals as defined in the regulation and SED guidance
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the Department with any information necessary to conduct annual monitoring pursuant to the regulations
- If this APPR Plan is being submitted subsequent to July 1, 2012, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Carlisle Kaiser *5/1/13*

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Kelly C. Stotchen *5/1/13*

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Heidi Green *5/1/13*

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

monica pyburn *5/1/13*